



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

III.—NEW READINGS FROM THE FREISING FRAGMENTS OF THE FABLES OF HYGINUS.

The text of the mythographer Hyginus rests upon a lost manuscript (s. IX) used for the *editio princeps* by Jacobus Micyllus in Basle, 1535. Five small fragments of this manuscript, aggregating about a hundred lines, were found thirty years ago by Ziegler, at Regensburg, in the binding of a book. They are known as Codex Frisingensis 237, or Monacensis 6437, and now, like the much earlier acquired MSS which formerly belonged to the neighboring monastery of Freising, repose in the Staatsbibliothek in Munich. These fragments of Hyginus were first edited by Halm, in the *Sitzungsberichte d. Münch. Akad.*, 1870, p. 317 ff. The only other MS tradition is contained in some bits preserved in the Codex Strozianus of the Germanicus-scholia (s. XIV), and the palimpsest leaves (containing 34 lines) discovered by Niebuhr in the Vatican.

The Freising fragments are written in the Beneventan minuscule, so familiar from the Tacitus, Apuleius, and other classical MSS of Montecassino.

Micyllus, who did not distinguish between Lombardic and Beneventan, described his source as "liber externis ac Longobardicis notis scriptus."

The hands are of the ninth century, the first Beneventan period, and much resemble the type of plate XXXVI in the *Paleografia artistica di Montecassino*, a facsimile of cod. 3 (dated 812) containing the works of Alcuin (cf. M. Thompson, *Gr. and Lat. Palaeogr.*, p. 220); but it is later than the Cod. Bambergensis of Gregory of Tours, *De Cursu Stellarum* (ed. Haase, Vratislaviae, 1853). It probably contained about 25 lines to the page, and the body of the text was nearly square. On the larger fragment there is an outer margin on pp. 1, 2 of 1 $\frac{3}{4}$ ", and pp. 3, 4 of 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". The first folio averages about 46 letters to the line; the second, about 50. The scribe of the first folio wrote a heavier, less regular and beautiful hand, with less careful alignment; his taller letters sloped to the right, whereas in the second folio, and the smaller fragments, they are perpendicular. The illuminated

initials, of which we have three, and the capitals, introducing the several labors of Hercules, belong to the early Beneventan period.

Upon my detecting a false reading from one of the fragments, Dr. Ludwig Traube, of the University of Munich, advised a careful and complete examination, so that the following corrections and new readings are entirely supplementary to Halm, and Maurice Schmidt (edidit Ienae, 1872). The lithographic facsimile appended to Schmidt's edition, though poor, shows several of the readings given below. All references are to the paging of Schmidt.

P. 51, 9 (fab. XVII). Traces of the red heading of XVIII below *filio nauem* show —e. s of Phineus.

P. 52, 16 (fab. XXI). Phrxi: cod. has *phrysi*, not *phrisi*.

P. 55, 1 (fab. XXV). The remains of the illuminated initial A, which can easily be compared with the M below in XXVI, show that the chapter began with *Aetae*, not *Medea*. The *ed. princ.* and Schmidt give the order *Medea Aetae et Idyiae filia* as in CCXXXVIII, p. 133, 17: *Medea Aetae filia Mermerum et Pheretem filios (interfecit)*, and this is the regular order, and the usual mode of opening the myth. But Hyginus sometimes varies this; e. g. 41, 15 (VIII) *Nyctei regis in Boeotia fuit filia Antiopa*; but in 41, 1 (VII) *Antiopa Nyctei filia*, etc., or 98, 11 (CVIII); 24, 5 (CXLV); 25, 12 (CLI); 62, 15 (LXIII). In XXII and XXIII just preceding, *Aeta* is the initial word, although the subject of the latter is Absyrtus. We may have here another instance of a change in the word-order, due to the careless copy used by Micyllus (vid. Halm, p. 325), which might easily have included the title of the myth, *Medea*, in the text.

P. 55, 8. *muneri*: cod. *mun'* (i. e. *munus*) corrected to *muneri* by the first hand.

munere: cod. *munerae*.

P. 55, 9. *conflagravit*: cod. *confraglavit* with *r* sloping to the left, inserted in finer black ink by corrector. Under the *l* is the trace of faint, comma-like stroke.

P. 55, 10. *et Pheretem interfecit*: cod. has *et ferê^{tu'} inter fecit* corrected by the first hand.

P. 55, 11. *profugit Corintho*: cod. has *profugit* ≡ *Corintho*, with traces of *a* or *e* under the erasure. (Cf. 38, 2 *profugit ab Thebis*; 55, 17 *ab Athenis redit*; 119, 15 *iter faceret a Troezene*.)

P. 55, 13, 14 (fab. XXVI). On the lower edge of the parchment, where the line has been cut, by comparing the text of Micyllus, the tops of the following letters can be seen:

. ed . s s . . . rd . s d dê.'

with space for the words

Medus postea sacerdos Dianę Medęa'.

P. 56, 6 (fab. XXVII). Creontis filium se esse mentitus est: cod. *sē ēē mentitus*. Just below in 56, 9 cod. has se sacerdotem Dianae *ementita*; so also Micyllus in 104, 2 (fab. CXX) *illa ementita est* dicitque eos sceleratos signum contaminasse. The only instance of *mentiri* is 60, 5 (LVII) of Sthenoboea: *illa viro suo mentita est* se ab eo compellatam, where the context gives a different meaning. In our passage the combination *ēēē* might easily account for the loss of an *e* in *ementitus* through haplography.

P. 56, 9. *ementita esset*: so Mic., Halm and Schmidt; but the cod. (in which the lines are here very dim) has *est* with trace of the ligature of *st*. There is hardly room for *ēēt* (*esset*) and no vestige of the sign of contraction. The change from subjunctive to indicative is needed in this very corrupt passage.

P. 56, 9. *dixit sterilitatem se expiare posse*: cod. has above the beginning of *sterilitatem* faint but distinct traces of what resembles a capital B, which seems to be the abbreviation *q*, for *que*, inserted by a later hand. The locution *emendita dixit que* may be supported in Hyginus by 104, 2 (CXX) *illa ementita est dicit que* and perhaps by the paraphrase 110, 27 (CXXVI).

P. 56, 11. *arbitrans eum patris iniuriam exequi uenisse ibique imprudens filium prodidit*: such is the reading of the *textus receptus*. Cod. has *imp^{ru}dens*, the letters *ru* being superscribed by the first hand. The unmistakable reading *ibique* (*ibiq.*) has caused great trouble. The *que* is not wanted with *arbitrans . . . imprudens*, while the correct reading *est* for *esset* debars Schmidt's transposition of *ibique* to between *uenisset* and *regi*. The proper point of departure, then, is Hyginus' usage. In 84, 6, 7 (LXXXVII) we read: At is (Thyestes) Atrei filium Plisthenem . . . ad Atreum interficiendum misit: quem Atreus *credens* fratris filium esse *imprudens* filium occidit. Again, 116, 24 (CXXXVII) Merope *credens* eum esse filii sui interfectorem, qui dormiebat, in chalcidicum cum securi uenit *inscia* ut filium suum interficeret etc. Cf.

also 111, 13 (CXXVII) and 97, 15 (CVII). Hence, if the MS reading be correct, there must be a lacuna containing an infinitive co-ordinate with *uenisse*. Phrases of the type *uenit ibique se aspexit, est profectus ibique remansit* are a mannerism of the style of Hyginus, e. g. 19, 3, 4; 22, 12; 25, 2; 34, 16; (cf. also 34, 8 and 52, 15;) 39, 9; 59, 5; 108, 2; 111, 12; 111, 18; 124, 9. The second verb is generally neuter or passive in sense. From the proximity of *in custodiam eum conici* (line 6) and *in custodia haberi* in the lines above 10 and 11, a phrase such as *non diu in custodia haberi posse* may have been lost. In case of a bad transmission in *ibique*, the easiest way out is to read *ibi* with Scheffer; but other emendations have been proposed.

I would therefore read lines 4-12 as follows: Medus Aegei et Medeae filius, ut uidit se in inimici potestatem uenisse, Hippoten Creontis filium se esse ementitus est. Rex diligentius quaerit et in custodiam eum conici iussit. Ubi sterilitas et penuria frugum dicitur fuisse (cf. 38, 16; 73, 23; 85, 9). Quo Medea in curru iunctis draconibus cum uenisset, regi se sacerdotem Dianae ementita est dixitque sterilitatem se expiare posse; et cum a rege audisset Hippoten Creontis filium in custodia haberi, arbitrans eum patris iniuriam exequi uenisse ibique < > imprudens filium prodidit. Nam regi persuadet, etc.

P. 56, 17, 18. The tops of the following letters at the clipped bottom of the page can be deciphered with the help of the received text:

.....d.d..i.ss.....i.i.r.s.e.e..ed.s.r...d.t....se.

with space agreeing for

ei tradidit iussit q, aui sui iniurias exeq Medus re audita Persen

P. 57, 7 (fab. XXVIII). After *atropos* with space agreeing for *hi cu' Diana'*, the lower part of *co'firmare* can be seen, where the line has been cut.

P. 57, 11. The words *alī ab altero*, inserted after *auersi*, are in a different ink, like that used for the marginal *estimans*, p. 63, 9 (XXVIII), and the inserted clause in 63, 12. The *a* of *alī* has the half-uncial form as only here in the fragments. Halm remarks (p. 322, 6 note): "über der Zeile ergänzt, aber von erster Hand, wie überhaupt von Correcturen; von zweiter Hand keine Spur sich vorfindet, ausgenommen die zu XXV bemerkte Rasur" (erasure of *ac*). But the corrections in 55, 10 *ferē^{um}*, 55, 7 *exue-*

nenⁱs, and others seem from a different hand from 57, 11; 63, 12, and several others.

P. 57, 10-12. Qui (Otos et Ephialtes) ad inferos dicuntur hanc poenam pati: ad columnam, auersi alter ab altero, serpentibus sunt deligati. †Est styx inter columnam sedens, ad quam sunt deligati. This passage has been the despair of all editors, and, judging from the several corrections in the MS, the trouble goes back of the Freising copy. In line 12, the first wrote *est stri*, corrected to *stys* or *styx*, by the insertion, a little above the line, of a stroke making a *y* of the *r*, while the *i*-stroke of the Beneventan ligature was prolonged into *s* or *x*. The word *inter* extends three letters into the margin; *columnam* is written '*colu'na*', the initial *c* being of the 'broken-backed,' Lombardic type, as occurs nowhere else in the fragments except in a ligature with *r* where the case is doubtful. Barth conjectures *est* (= *exest*) *strix viscera*; Staveren and older editors take *columnam sedens* as a Grecism; C. Schwenk (Rh. Mus., 1858, XIII, p. 477) suggested *est styx inter eos super columnam sedens*. Without presuming to solve the problem, I would refer to 59, 19, 20 (LV) qui (Tityus) novem iugeribus ad inferos exporrectus iacere dicitur, et serpens ei appositus est, qui *iecur* eius exesset, quod *cum luna* recrescit. Also 23, 10-12 (CXLIIII), of Prometheus: aquilam apposuit, quae cor eius exesset, quae quantum die ederat, tantum nocte crescebat. *Iecur* may shed light on *inter*, and *cum luna recrescit* on '*colu'na*' *sedens*.

P. 63, 9 (fab. XXVIII). *estimans* in cod. is written in the margin.

9. *eu'* is written over the *t* of *thalamis*.

11. qui tam libens cum ea concubuit is inserted by the second hand over *ut unum diem* and attention called to the omission by ÷ in the margin.

16. The tops of the following letters can be seen at the bottom of the page after *securam*:

mirari c . e . . t & . . eri

the space agreeing with *mirari coepit et queri*.

P. 64, 5 (fab. XXX). Before *dormientem* stand in the vulgate *et si quis eam*. Traces of all these can be discerned at the top of the page, but there seems to be one letter too many for the usual *ea'* and the last letter as written can not be *m*.

P. 64, 6. et si quis eam (sc. hydram) dormientem transierat, vestigia eiis afflabat, et *malorum* cruciatu moriebatur. The correct reading of the codex is *maiori* cruciatu, the word being written with the tall *i* (cf. *maiorem* in cod., pag. 4, vs. 9) and the usual ligature for *ri*. For the abl. of comparatives in *i*, see Neue Formenlehre, II³ 265-7. Our MS always has *-oru'* for *orum*. It is surprising that so careful a palaeographer as Halm should not have observed this. However, we have here another bit of evidence that these fragments are part of the MS used by Micyllus for his *editio princeps*.

P. 64, 11. Euristhêi: cod. has *h* written over *ê*.

P. 64, 18, 19. The following can be traced at the lower edge:

... d' r . . s l' mpon xánthus dí . us ' l . . e . . ma ' . . . t

corresponding to: (nomi)na Podárgus Lámpon Xánthus Dínus. Hippólyten Amazonia' Mart|. There is not space for Martis et (read by Schmidt), and *et* is always expressed by the compendium &.

P. 68, 7 (fab. XXXVII). ut tunc: cod. has *ut* in the margin, a little below the line. It may have been omitted because of the following *tu*-. Hyginus uses the locution *praecipere ut*.

P. 68, 11. Probably an erasure between *lapidemque* and *ostendit*.

One important point worth noting in a manuscript containing so many Greek names, is that in most cases their accented syllable is marked with ^ or '. Among instances not noted by Halm: 55, 12 Pandíonis; 63, 8 Amphiítrion; 63, 8 Oecháliam; 63, 10 Oechália; 64, 12 Stympphálides; 64, 18, 19, the names of Diomedes' horses: Podárgus, Lámpon, Xánthus, Dínus; 64, 19 Hippólyten. The accents appear on the following Latin words: 56, 12 persuádet; 64, 7 interfêcit; 55, 6 sê. The ink of these accent-marks is so faded that it is not easy to say whether they belong to the first or a later hand. Such marks are found in liturgical works, the Vitae Sanctorum school-books, and, in general, texts which were to be read aloud. This is a point interesting for the history of the transmission.